

A M F  
L E T T E R

T O T H E

Reverend Mr TOPLADY,

Occasioned by his late LETTER

T O T H E

Reverend Mr WESLEY.

---

By THOMAS OLIVERS.

---

L O N D O N, Printed :

And Sold by E. C A B E in Ave-Mary Lane.

1771.

41 F

J. E. T. E. K.

RECEIVED

OF THE

THE

WESTLEY.



LONDON

1851






A

## LETTER, &amp;c.

S I R,


 OME time ago, your Letter to Mr *Wesley*, dated March 26, 1770, was put into my hand, with a request that I would make some remarks upon it. I know not why this request was made to *me*; unless it is because thinking men judged you unworthy the notice of a superior person.

At first, I thought you deserved no notice at all; considering with what almost unparalleled contempt, you, a man of yesterday, and of no character in the world, have treated Mr *Wesley*; a Gentleman, whose literary accomplishments, as well as indefatigable labours, are hardly to be equalled: To say nothing of his age and usefulness, which certainly will have *some weight* with every MODEST young man.

But when I consider, how few are able to judge of the merits of a cause, by hearing one side only; and with how many, a warm assertion, a meer dogmatism, will have all the weight of a demonstration; when I consider, that many of your well-meaning readers may be of this number, and that, if no answer be given, they may conclude, by your assurance, that you are unanswerable; I judge it may be worth while to lay before you and them a few brief animadversions.

But, as I cannot prevail with myself to throw off all good manners; and to expose that measure of common sense I am possessed of, to the contempt of every candid reader; much less to disclaim the meekness and gentleness of CHRIST; I shall not pretend to treat you according to your deserts: Was I to do this, I must embellish almost every page, with such flowers as you seem peculiarly to admire: I should at every turn call you, "Jesuit"—"Pope"—"Bellwether"—"KNAVE!"—A "Theological coward"—a "Religious gambler"—a "LYING SOPHISTER!" I should compare you to an "Oyster-woman"—a "Porter"—a "Carman"—a "Chimney-sweeper"—to a "Clumsey bungling anatomist"—to an "Insane person rolling himself in the mud"—to a "Lurking, sly assassin!" I should tell you of your "Low, serpentine cunning"—of your "Dirty subterfuges"—of your "mean malicious impotence!" I should represent you, as a man equally void of "Honour and integrity;" and strongly insinuate that you are a "PERJURED" villain! Then, when I had thus hectorred and bullied you till I was weary; I should talk of transmitting you "To *Virginia* or *Maryland*, if not to TYBURN!"

Performances of this kind may appear wonderfully pretty to a beardless Batchelor of Arts, just stept, piping hot, out of an University. But that you, the Reverend Mr *Toplady*, Vicar of *Bradcombury*, and Chaplain to a Right Honourable Lord! should imagine such productions are fit to occupy the press; or that they in any degree deserve the attention of the public, is really surprising. From the various titles which you bear, and  
from

from your seeming contempt of every thing *mean and dirty*; we might naturally expect, that scurrility, and personal abuse, would be deemed by you, only as the *excrements of the press*; and that you would pronounce all such scribblers, as use them, to be mere nuisances in the republic of letters.

As this remark is the result of cool deliberation, you may be assured I shall not address you, as you have Mr *Wesley*: No; if *Michael* the Archangel *durst not bring a railing accusation* against the Devil; much less dare I against you. But though I may not be scurrilous, I may be *very plain*, both in pointing out wherein you have spoken amiss; and in making such reflections thereon, as occasion may require.

You say, page 2. "Though you," Mr *Wesley*, "are  
 " neither mentioned, nor alluded to, throughout the  
 " whole book; yet it could hardly be imagined, that  
 " a treatise, apparently tending to lay the ax to the  
 " root of those pernicious doctrines, which, for more  
 " than thirty years past, you have endeavoured to palm  
 " on your credulous followers, with all the sophistry of  
 " a Jesuit, and the authority of a Pope, should long  
 " pass without some censure from a restless Arminian,  
 " who has so eagerly endeavoured to distinguish him-  
 " self as the bell-wether of his deluded thousands."

If we strip this paragraph of its ornaments, all which it means is,

Though you, Mr *Wesley*, are not mentioned in it, yet it could hardly be imagined, that a Treatise, confuting your favourite doctrines, should pass without some censure from you.

Now, what need was there of saying more? Would not the meaning have been as compleat, if you had not added those embellishments, "Credulous followers,—  
 " the sophistry of a Jesuit,—the authority of a Pope?" Would any proper idea have been lost, if you had not called Mr *Wesley* a "Restless Arminian," — or the "bell-wether of his deluded thousands?" Does this language give us so just an idea of any thing, as of the  
 malevolence



malevolence and impetuosity of your Spirit ; and of the smallness of your acquaintance with the rules of common decency ?

However, you are right in this, It could not well be imagined, such a Treatise should pass without some censure from Mr *Wesley*. The reason is obvious. The doctrines which you call pernicious, he calls the truths of God ; by the preaching of which, he has been instrumental in turning *thousands* from the error of their Way. This, the most partial eye has seen ; the most prejudiced heart believed ; and the most malignant tongue, (perhaps not even your own excepted,) has been forced to acknowledge.

Of those awakened by his means, besides multitudes who have gone back into the world, or joined with other denominations, and beside thousands who are gone to Paradise ; there are, at this time, near thirty thousand under his care. As he finds that these are the envy, not only of the Devil and the world, but, likewise of many good, but mistaken men ; he thinks himself obliged, by every sacred tie, to defend them, to the utmost of his power. Hence it is that he hath published so many *defensive* pieces, in particular against Dr *Gill*, Count *Zinzendorf*, *Sandiman*, *Cudworth* and *Yous* : whose Antinomianism appears to him to be subversive of the whole power and practice of Religion.

But what seems to give particular umbrage to you is, that Mr *Wesley* has not viewed you in that important light which you think you deserve, and which you seem earnestly to desire. Hence you complain, that " In the month of *March*, 1770, out sneaks a printed paper (consisting of *one sheet*, folded into *twelve pages*, and price *one penny*)"—Was ever before such an affront put upon a man of eminence ! But why *sneaks*, Sir ? Could you find no word a little more polite ! but politeness is not your taste.

What seems to be emphatically criminal is, that this speaking paper consists only " Of *one sheet*, folded into " *twelve pages*, and price *one penny*." I suppose you intend a climax here. Then the first degree of criminality, that this paper consists only of *one sheet* ; is an



an alarming circumstance ! The second, that it is folded into *twelve pages*, is doubtless an huge aggravation of its guilt ! The third, and which is worst of all is, it is *price one penny* !

This evil, however, to do you justice, you have been careful to avoid. For, first, your paper consists of *four half sheets* ; and these are folded into *thirty-two pages* ; *price sixpence* ! But then, Sir, all the praise of this does not belong to you. To do every man justice, you must give a large measure of it to those you employed as scavengers, in collecting dirt, for you to throw in Mr Wesley's face. The printer, likewise, must have his share, for employing large types and thick scaleboards on the occasion ; and for giving us plenty of margin for our money : By this means you have been able to fill an octavo page, with eleven lines less, and in each line, eight or ten letters less, than Mr Wesley has in one of his pages in twelves. Had it not been for the liberal assistance of such auxiliaries, you might have found some difficulty in furnishing us with *half a sheet*, folded into *six pages*, for our *sixpence*.

*Ibid.* You ask, " Why did you not make your " abridgment *truly public* ? " He has made it as truly public as he does his writings in general. No ; you say, " It privately crept abroad from *the Foundery*."—*Crept* abroad ! nay surely it *walked*, if it did not *run* ; and that pretty swiftly too ; for, within a few weeks after its publication, it was in every part of *England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland*. " It was sold indeed," you say, " but it was sold under the rose." It was sold in the same manner his other writings are. " It was carefully " circulated in the dark." It was not, Sir. Here is a defect either in your *veracity* or *information*. " In " such conduct," you say, page 3. " I can discover " much of the *Jesuit*, but nothing of the *Saint*." If I durst adopt the language of *Billingsgate* and you, perhaps, I might tell you what I discover in this *illiberal* remark. But, at present, I shall only observe, that it is very strange you should unchristian Mr Wesley for the *manner* of publishing a pamphlet. You go on, " I

" had, to this hour, remained unapprized of the secret stab, but for the information received from some of superior integrity to yourself." How secret? When it was, in a few weeks, published over a great part of the three kingdoms?

" I will put *Christianity* quite out of the question, and suppose it to have no kind of influence. But should you not act as a man of common honour?" Ah, poor Mr *Wesley*! what a case will you be in, before Mr *Toplady* has done with you? He has already divested you of *common grace*, and *common honour*; it will be well if he leaves you in possession of *common sense*! But to return; pray, Mr *Toplady*, what honour is it that you want; or that you really think you deserve? You have been treated with the same honour, which has satisfied some of the greatest writers in the kingdom; and surely, Sir, you have not the vanity to desire more! "Come forth openly, Sir, in future," you say, "like an honest, generous *Affailant*; and, from this moment forward, disdain to act the ignoble part of a lurking, sly assassin." Come forth openly? How openly do you desire? He has already appeared against you, over a great part of the three kingdoms; Do you want him to sound the alarm over the four quarters of the globe? As to the advice you give him concerning altering his plan of operations, "from this moment," I would observe; that it is pity you were not in being about fifty years ago, to have instructed him in the art of attacking a formidable enemy; when, *perhaps*, he was almost as great a novice as you and I are at present. But, as this was not the case, I fear it is now too late, and that your labour will be lost. Mr *Wesley* is now an old man, and old men are not easily persuaded to adopt new measures; therefore, if he has not, to "this moment," learned how to publish an abridgment of a poor pamphlet, I fear he never will.

*Ibid.* You ask, "Why did you not abridge me faithfully and fairly?" He has abridged you, just in such manner, as he thinks you deserve. For, first, he looks on most of your propositions as little better than  
self-

*self-evident absurdities*: and the arguments with which you have endeavoured to support them, as exceeding frivolous. In the second place, he thinks that you are totally deficient in that modesty, which ought to be one of the chief ornaments of your years: In other words; that you are quite too dogmatical in treating a subject of this abstruse nature: a subject, which has caused so many persons of the greatest learning, and deepest experience, (and with whom, you are not worthy to be named) to despair of seeing it fully investigated on this side eternity.

Now, I appeal to any man, if such writers ought to be treated with that regard which is due (only) to candour and modesty? In general, contemptuous silence is all they can claim. Nevertheless, sometimes, it may be worth while to point out their errors. And, if burlesque or irony may ever be used, it is toward such SELF-IMPORTANT NOVICES. What wonder, then, that Mr Wesley, instead of putting on a coat-of-mail, and drawing out heavy artillery, for *you*; has thought it better, both for his own credit, and for your improvement, to take the *ferula*, to correct your pert forwardness?

This he has done, in an abridgment of your performance; in which, he has presented the reader with your propositions, just as they are; only, in a few instances, he has added two or three words, to take off a little of the false colouring, by which you endeavour to hide their deformity: and, in the conclusion, he has summed up the whole as you *ought* to have done; but, which, you were *ashamed* of doing.

*Ibid.* You ask again, "Why must you lard your "ridiculous compendium with *additions* and *interpolations* of your own?" Why? To make you, who profess to be an absolute Predestinarian, speak without disguise the language of absolute Predestination. But what are these additions and interpolations? You tell us, page 4. "A *false colouring* must be superinduced, "by inserting a SENTENCE OR TWO NOW AND THEN of "your own. After which, you close the motly piece,



" with an entire paragraph, forged, every word of it, by yourself."

Here we have two things laid to Mr *Wesley's* charge. The first, that he has inserted A SENTENCE OR TWO NOW AND THEN of his own; *besides* that paragraph with which he concludes. The second, that by this means, a false colouring is superinduced. Now, Sir, I not only deny both these propositions, but will demonstrate that they are absolutely false.

And first, That he has inserted A SENTENCE OR TWO NOW AND THEN of his own; *besides* that paragraph with which he concludes. All these additions I have now before me, written, with Mr *Wesley's* own hand, on the margin of the pamphlet he abridged.

Before I shew what these are, it must be observed, that all which he has written on the margin, cannot be taken into the account. For, first, there is, now and then, a word, or a letter, which was necessary to connect the sentences. Secondly, there is a remark in your 83d page, where Mr *Wesley* asks, " Is this a parallel case ? " which no one will look upon as an addition, or an interpolation. Nor, thirdly, is the last paragraph to be reckoned among them; because you tell us, that " *after* " those sentences, " this paragraph " concludes the motly piece." What, therefore, we are to inquire for, is, A SENTENCE OR TWO, of Mr *Wesley's* OWN, NOW AND THEN inserted; *besides* these odd words and letters; *besides* that, which is, properly, a remark of his own; and *besides* that paragraph, which concludes the piece.

Now, Sir, where are we to look for this SENTENCE OR TWO added NOW AND THEN? I have not found them yet. Nor can I find so much as A SINGLE SENTENCE, from one end of the abridgment to the other. It is true, in page 45. Mr *Wesley* has inserted the word, *chiefly*, instead of the word, *only*; and in p. 80. where you had said, " He is a tyrant who governs contrary to law," he has said, to " justice and mercy." And, once more, in p. 87. he has added, not A SENTENCE  
OR



or two; but a *single clause*, consisting of the five monosyllables following, "which they could not help."

And do you call this, "Inserting a sentence or two of his own *now and then*!" I beseech you, dear Sir, do not speak another word about *misrepresentation*, *falsehood* or *injustice*. Had Mr *W.* given you such an advantage as this, mercy upon him! How you would have bellowed over him!

The second part of your objection is, that "by these additions and interpolations, a false colouring is superinduced:" The contrary of which I am next to demonstrate.

And first, as to the change of the word *only*, for the word *chiefly*, I cannot see any false colouring which is superinduced thereby. For though you say, "Divine pre-ordination has for its object, *all things* that are created—from the highest angel—to the minutest atom;" yet your meaning is, that it *chiefly* refers to angels and men, as Mr *W.* has said. This is evident from the following words: "However, the antient fathers only make use of the word predestination, as it refers to angels and men: and, it is used by the Apostle *Paul*, in a more limited sense still, so as by it he means that branch of it, which respects God's election and designation of his people to eternal life." Certainly your meaning is, that though predestination has for its object *all things* that are created; yet, according to the antient fathers, and the Apostle *Paul*, it *chiefly* refers to angels and men.

Nor is there any injury done to your general argument, by the change of this word. So far from it, that I think Mr *W.* has done you singular service, by leaving out what, to many, would be a strong objection. You had been labouring to prove, that although the word predestination chiefly refers to angels and men; yet, it has *all things* for its object. Now, Sir, I conceive that the following words give up a considerable part of the proof of this; "The antient fathers *only* make use of the word predestination, as it refers to angels and men;—and it is used, by the Apostle *Paul*, in a  
"more

“ more limited sense still ; to mean only that branch of  
 “ it which respects God’s election and designation  
 “ of his people to eternal life.” Sir, I apprehend  
 you have acknowledged too much. For if the Apostle  
*Paul*, and the antient fathers, make use of the word  
 predestination *only* as it refers to angels and men, is it  
 not presumption for the followers of that Apostle, and  
 the children of those fathers, to make use of it as re-  
 ferring to all things ? Moreover, does it not follow,  
 that all who thus make use of it, have no authority from  
 antiquity for so doing ; besides that of the *Stoicks* and of  
 some other HEATHENS ? I therefore think you ought to  
 be thankful to Mr *W.* for the service he has done you in  
 this instance.

Nor is this all ; for your very *distion* is mended by  
 passing through Mr *W.*’s hand. — You had said, “ How-  
 “ ever the antient fathers *only* make use of the word  
 “ predestination, as it refers to angels and men.” Ac-  
 cording to this construction, you may be understood to  
 mean, that the antient fathers, and none besides, have  
 thus used the word. Had Mr *W.* wrote this sentence at  
 large, I am persuaded he would have said, However,  
 the antient fathers make use of the word predestination  
*only* as it refers to angels and men : or, as it is in the  
 abridgment, “ All beings whatsoever, from the highest  
 “ angel, to the meanest reptile, are the objects of  
 “ God’s eternal decrees. However, it *chiefly* refers to  
 “ angels and men.”

Seeing then your meaning is preserved, your argu-  
 ment strengthened, and your language amended ; you  
 have no reason to complain of a false colouring being  
 superinduced.

The next place where there is any alteration, is in  
 your definition of a tyrant, page 80. “ He is a tyrant,  
 you say, “ in the common acceptation of the word,  
 “ who—being originally a lawful prince, abuses his  
 “ power, and governs contrary to law.” Mr *W.* in-  
 stead of saying, Contrary to *law* ; has said, “ Contrary  
 “ to *justice and mercy.*”

That

That your account of a tyrant is absurd, appears from hence; it supposes, 1. That there can be no such things as *tyrannical laws*. 2. That those persons who are, almost, universally allowed to be abominable tyrants, (such as *Nero, Domitian, Lewis the Fourteenth*, and our own *bloody Mary*) were no tyrants at all; since they had *law* for all their infernal proceedings. Excuse a little digression, I will shew more particularly, 1. That a person may govern *according to law*, and yet be a *great tyrant*. And, 2. That he may govern *contrary to law*, and yet be *no tyrant*.

And, 1. A person may govern according to law, and yet be a *great tyrant*. Suppose, for instance; a King to enact a *law*, That all persons, who were born in his dominions, should be laid under an *irresistible necessity of committing high treason*; and that in consequence of committing this, a *very great majority* of them should be put to a *cruel death*. Suppose again, That in consequence of this *decree*, all the thousands afterwards born, are born under this *necessity*, in consequence thereof commit this *treason*, and in consequence of committing it, a very great majority of them are *actually burnt alive*. Would not you, would not *all the world* look upon such an one as a most abominable tyrant? First, for making such a law? And, Secondly, for *executing* it?

Transfer this to the King of heaven; and suppose he decreed, from all eternity, That the whole human race shall come into the world under an *irresistible necessity of sinning*; and that in consequence of sinning, a *very great majority* of them shall suffer the torments of the damned for ever. Suppose again, that in virtue of this *decree*, all are born under an *irresistible necessity* of sinning; that in consequence of this *necessity*, all do actually *sin*; and in consequence of this *sin*, a great majority of them are cast into a lake of fire; is it possible, without confounding all distinction between good and evil, to look upon such a God, as any other than a most dreadful tyrant? And are we not constrained to behold him in this light, first, for making such a decree; and, secondly, for *executing* it?



2: A Person may govern *contrary to law*, and yet be *no* tyrant. Perhaps there is not a Prince upon earth, who is; himself, subject to law, and who, in the general, governs according to it; but, in various instances, acts or governs contrary to the laws he is subject to. For instance, were not some of the first steps which *Henry* the Eighth took, towards the Reformation, contrary to those laws by which Popery was established? And were not some of the first steps which *Queen Elizabeth* took, in restoring the Reformation, contrary to those laws of *Mary*, by which she had suppressed it? Yet, who will say that these were tyrants in those particulars? Or what if any Heathen, or Mahometan Prince, was to take some steps towards abolishing their present superstitions, and establishing Christianity in their stead, (which certainly would be contrary to their present laws) would you, would any Christian, deem such an one a tyrant on that account? You therefore see how absurd it is to say, "He is a tyrant who governs contrary to law."

As to the account of a tyrant, which *Mr W.* has given; I would observe, first, that it is *strictly TRUE* and *PROPER*. And, secondly, that no false colouring is superinduced thereby. The truth of this last proposition appears from hence; you have been labouring to prove that God, in the decree of reprobation, "did not act an *unjust, tyrannical or cruel part*." In endeavouring to acquit him of the charge of tyranny, you have said, that he "does not act contrary to law." Now, I insist on it, that *Mr W.* has done your business more effectually, by supposing you to say, "Contrary to justice and mercy." Because acting, either *contrary to law*, or *according to it*, is no proof of a tyrant, as is shewn above; but acting *contrary to justice and mercy*, is a *demonstration* of it. And that no false colouring it, *upon the whole*, superinduced, appears from hence; that what *Mr W.* has here supposed you to say; you yourself have insisted on, and that largely too, both in the *preceeding* and *following* words. Therefore,



fore, in this instance, you have no cause to complain of misrepresentation.

The third place where an addition is inserted, is in page 87. where you have been endeavouring to reconcile the doctrine of reprobation, with the doctrine of a future judgment.—On this you observe, that “CHRIST  
“ will then *properly* fit as a Judge; and openly *publish* and  
“ solemnly *ratify* his everlasting decrees, by receiving  
“ the elect, body and soul, into glory, and by passing  
“ sentence on the non-elect (not for their having done  
“ what they could not help, but) for their wilful ignorance of divine things, and their obstinate unbelief;  
“ for their omissions of moral duty, and for their repeated iniquity and transgression,”—“which,” says Mr W. “they could not help.”

Observe, 1. That this addition cannot be called “a false colouring;” because, strictly speaking, it is no colouring at all. For as you have declared, two lines above, (very absurdly, on your supposition,) that the sentence will be passed on the reprobate, “not for  
“ their having done what they could not help;” and as Mr W. has left this clause standing in the abridgment, every body must see, at first view, that the last clause is Mr W.’s; and that it is added by way of burlesque on your astonishing inconsistency.

Observe, 2. That suppose we allow *some* colouring to be superinduced, yet it cannot be a *false* one; seeing it is not only that, which you, as a *Predestinarian*, ought to make use of, but what, in effect, you HAVE made use of, in *various parts* of your translation. Let the following passages serve as a specimen. “Bishop  
“ *Hopkins* did not go a jot too far in asserting,” that  
“ NOT A DUST FLIES ON A BEATEN ROAD, BUT GOD  
“ RAISETH IT, CONDUCTS its uncertain motion, and,  
“ by his particular care, CONVEYS it to the certain  
“ place he had BEFORE APPOINTED for it: nor shall  
“ the most fierce and tempestuous wind hurry it any  
“ farther.” Preface, page 4. Again, page 5. “W  
“ should have our hearts well established in the firm  
“ and unwavering belief of this truth; that we

“EVER comes to pass, BE IT GOOD OR EVIL, we may look up to the hand and disposal of all, to God—” page 25. “God worketh all things in all men; even “WICKEDNESS IN THE WICKED.” page 50. “He,” man, “fell in consequence of the divine decree.” Pref. p. 13. “WHATEVER, therefore, comes to pass, comes “to pass as a part of *the original plan*.” Observ. p. 7. “*Whatever* comes to pass, comes to pass BY VIRTUE “of this *absolute omnipotent will of God*.” page 14. “WHATEVER things come to pass, come to pass NE- “CESSARILY.” *Ibid.* “WHATEVER MAN DOES, HE “DOES NECESSARILY.” p. 15. “ALL THINGS turn “out according to divine predestination; not only the “works we do outwardly, but even the thoughts we “think inwardly.” p. 20. “WHATSOEVER God hath “determined, concerning *every individual person* and “*thing*, shall *surely* and INFALLIBLY be accomplished “in and upon them.”

Page 76. “They who are not saved from sin, must “unavoidably perish: but the reprobate are not saved “from sin; for they have neither *will* nor *power* to “save themselves; and God, though he certainly *can*, “yet *will not* save them: therefore their perdition is “UNAVOIDABLE.”

Now, Sir, if all this be as you say, then let all men judge if “CHRIST will not pass sentence on the “non-elect for that ignorance and unbelief; for those “omissions of moral duties; and for those repeated “iniquities and transgressions,” WHICH, (as Mr W. says) THEY COULD NOT HELP?

But this clause, you may say, is directly contrary to what you have expressly declared but two lines above: *viz.* “That CHRIST will pass sentence on the non-elect, “not for having done what they could not help.” I allow it. But how you will reconcile this declaration and many more with the MAIN PROPOSITION, *asserted and defended by you*, I know not. Let the following *stances* serve as a specimen of the whole.

ALL *events* are in the hand of GOD. NOT A DUST FLIES ON A BEATEN ROAD, but GOD RAISETH it, CONDUCTS its uncertain motion; and, by his PARTICULAR care, CONVEYS it to the *certain place* he had BEFORE APPOINTED for it: nor shall the *most fierce and tempestuous wind* hurry it ANY FARTHER, *Preface*. Whatever he knows to be future, shall necessarily and infallibly come to pass, page 2.

WHATEVER *comes to pass*, comes to pass NECESSARILY, p. 14. WHATSOEVER *man does*, he does NECESSARILY, *ibid.*

Whatsoever comes to pass, BE IT GOOD OR EVIL, we may look up to the hand and disposal of ALL, to GOD, p. 5. In respect of GOD, there is NOTHING *casual* or *contingent* in the world. He APPOINTS ALL the *viciissitudes of things*, *ibid.*

GOD may, in some sense, be said to *will* the *being* and *commission* of sin, p. 13.

GOD worketh ALL *things* in ALL *men*, even WICKEDNESS in the wicked, p. 25.

It by no means follows, that they (the creatures) do not act *freely* and *spontaneously*, or that the evil they commit is to be charged on GOD, p. 7. The condemnation of the reprobate is UNAVOIDABLE; yet the necessity of it is so far from making them *mere machines*, or *involuntary agents*, that it does not, IN THE LEAST, INTERFERE with the *rational freedom of their will*; nor serve to render them less inexcusable, p. 77.

GOD's *free* and *voluntary* permission of sin, lays no man under any *forcible* or *compulsive* NECESSITY of committing it, p. 13.

If men do not believe his word, nor observe his precepts, *the fault* is in THEMSELVES: Their own unbelief and disobedience are NOT owing to any *ill* infused into them by GOD; but to the vitiosity of their depraved nature and perverseness of their own will, page 5.

Sin, as sin, is the abominable thing that his soul hateth, page 13.

GOD is the creator of the wicked, but NOT OF THEIR WICKEDNESS, p. 74.



To say that he *willeth* sin, doth not in the least detract from the holiness and rectitude of God, p. 14.

WHATSOEVER comes to pass, comes to pass BY VIRTUE of this ABSOLUTE OMNIPOTENT WILL of GOD, p. 7. His *will*, and the execution of it, are IRRESISTIBLE, *Preface*, p. 13.

The purpose or decree of God, signifies his everlasting appointment of some men to life, and of others to death : which appointment *flows* ENTIRELY from his own free and sovereign will, page 19.

The WILL of GOD is the primary and supreme cause of all THINGS, page 7. The ONLY reason that can be assigned why the Deity *does this*, or *omits that*, is, because it is his own free pleasure, p. 9. The SOLE CAUSE why some are saved, and others perish, proceeds from his WILLING the salvation of the former, and the perdition of the latter, p. 11.

He cannot, *consistently* with the PURITY of his nature, the glory of his attributes, and the truth of his declarations, be himself THE AUTHOR of sin, p. 74.

GOD does NOT FORCE them into sin, p. 71. In consequence of their natural depravity, they are VOLUNTARILY *biassed* and inclined to evil—and without ANY OTHER efficiency lay violent hands on their own soul, page 76.

He does not condemn any of those (the reprobate) MERELY because *he hath not chosen them*, but because THEY HAVE SINNED *against* HIM, page 74.

The reprobate shall undergo this punishment *justly* and on account of their sins. Sin is the meritorious and immediate cause of any man's damnation, p. 49. Again, the condemnation of the ungodly—is not unjust, seeing it is for sin, and only for sin. None are, or will be punished, but for their iniquities, p. 74.



No free-will of the creature can resist the will of God: — the human will cannot resist him, so as to make him *do more or less* than is his pleasure to do, p. 7. The WILL of GOD, which is the first cause of all things, should seem to lay a kind of necessity upon our wills, p. 8. *We can only do what GOD from eternity willed and foreknew we should*, p. 15. We are expressly told, that these PERSONS (the reprobates, spoken of by *Esaias*) could not believe, *ex natura*, they were not able; it was out of their power, p. 95.

Man is not excusable for neglecting God's will of command. *Pharaoh* was faulty, and therefore justly punishable for not obeying God's revealed will: — *Abraham* would have committed sin, had he refused to sacrifice *Isaac*. — *Herod*, *Pontius Pilate*, and the reprobate Jews, were justly condemned for putting CHRIST to death. — *Judas* is justly punished for perfidiously and wickedly betraying Christ, p. 6. He (CHRIST) will then properly sit as a Judge passing sentence on the non-elect (not for having done what they could not help, but) for their wilful ignorance of divine things, and their obstinate unbelief; for their omissions of moral duty, and for their repeated iniquities and transgressions, page 87.

I might go on; but to tell you the truth, I am tired with transcribing your absurdities and contradictions. But I must not leave this head without giving you a word of friendly admonition. Dear Sir, let us never again hear you complain of “inconsistencies and contradictions; of jarring principles (ever at intestine war with each other) or of incoherence in our religious systems.” Whoever else may cry out against these, I pray you, for modesty sake! to be quite silent. — “For, to apply your own remark) “YOUR scheme of doctrine reminds me of the “feet of a certain visionary image, which, as the sacred “penman acquaints us, seemed to be composed of  
“iran

" *iron and clay*. Heterogeneous materials may be put together, but will never incorporate with each other. Somewhat like the *necromantic soup* in the tragedy of *MACBETH*; your doctrines," Mr *Toplady*, " may be stirred into a chaotic jumble, but witchcraft itself would strive in vain to bring them into coalition."

But what gives you most offence of all is this; " You (Mr *W*.) " close the motly piece, with an entire paragraph, forged, every word of it, by yourself," p. 4. What this paragraph is, you tell him: " Your concluding paragraph, which you have the effrontery to palm on the world as *mine*, runs thus: " The sum of all is this: One in twenty (suppose) of mankind are elected; nineteen in twenty are reprobated. The elect shall be saved, do what they will; the reprobate shall be damned, do what they can. Reader, believe this, or be damned! Witness my hand; A—T—."

The *Words*, I acknowledge, are Mr *W*'s. But "*Words*" (you yourself, have told us) are *only* so far *valuable*, "*as they are the vehicles of meaning* \*." And by parity of reason, they are *only* so far *hurtful* to any one. Now Sir, I undertake to demonstrate, that there is *no meaning in these words*, which is not *purely your own*; and which you have not *plainly expressed* in many parts of your tract.

This paragraph, consists of three particulars: 1. A *supposed* proportion, as to number, in which the elect and reprobate stand to each other; " One in twenty (suppose) of mankind are elected; nineteen out of twenty are reprobated." 2. The terms on which both these are treated, with respect to their everlasting state; " The elect shall be saved, do what they will; the reprobate shall be damned, do what they can." 3. The necessity of believing this, " Reader, believe this, or be damned! Witness my hand. A—T—." And, 1. Here is a *supposed* proportion, as to number, in which the elect and reprobate stand to each other: " One in twenty (suppose) of mankind are elected; " nineteen

\* Preface to *Zanchius*, p. 11.

“ nineteen out of twenty reprobated.” That these expressions are not intended to ascertain the precise number of the elect and reprobate, is evident. The words are, “ One in twenty, SUPPOSE.” As if he had said, “ Let us, for argument sake, *suppose* a certain number, “ for an uncertain.” All therefore, that he here supposes you to say is, that a very small proportion of mankind are elected, and, of consequence, a great proportion reprobated.—And that he hath not misrepresented you in this, appears from your own words : “ It is but too certain, that, in the scriptures, are such “ awful passages as these ; *Broad is the way, and wide “ is the gate which leadeth unto destruction, and many “ there be that go in thereat : while on the other hand, “ Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, that leadeth “ unto life, and few there be that find it.*—MANY “ are called, but FEW chosen.—Fear not, little flock, “ it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom.—There is a remnant, according to the election “ of grace\*.” Here, Sir, you have not only acknowledged all that Mr W. has supposed you to say, but have also proved it from scripture.

2. We have, in this paragraph, the terms on which both the elect and reprobate shall be treated, with respect to their everlasting states : “ The elect shall be “ saved, do what they will ; the reprobate shall be “ damned, do what they can.”

That what Mr W. has here supposed you to say, is no misrepresentation of your *real meaning*, appears from what you yourself have said in various parts of your production. I shall consider this matter, 1. As it respects the elect and reprobates in general ; 2. As it respects each of them in particular.

And, 1. As it respects the elect and reprobates in general. “ Whatever he foreknows, shall necessarily and “ undoubtedly come to pass. For his knowledge can “ no more be frustrated, or his wisdom be deceived, “ than he can cease to be God,” p. 2. “ The will “ of God, respecting the *salvation and condemnation of* “ men,

\* Letter to Mr W. p. 19.



“ men, is never contrary to itself; he *immutably* wills  
 “ the salvation of the elect, and *vice-versâ*: nor can  
 “ he ever deviate from his own will in any instance  
 “ whatever, so that that should be done, which he  
 “ willeth not; or that not be brought to pass, which  
 “ he willeth,” p. 4. “ No free-will of the creature  
 “ can resist the will of God; for man cannot so will,  
 “ or nill, as to obstruct the divine determination, or  
 “ overcome the divine power.—It cannot be questioned  
 “ but God does *all things*, and ever did, according to  
 “ his *own purpose*: the human will cannot resist him, so  
 “ as to make him do *more* or *less* than it is his *pleasure*  
 “ to do,” p. 7. “ The *sole cause*, why some men are  
 “ saved, and others perish, proceeds from his *willing*  
 “ the *salvation* of the former, and the *perdition* of the  
 “ latter,” p. 11. “ It (the purpose or decree of God)  
 “ signifies his *everlasting appointment* of some men to life,  
 “ and of others unto death: which appointment flows  
 “ entirely from his own free and sovereign will,” p. 19.  
 “ His eternal predestination of men and things must be  
 “ immutable as himself, and, so far from being rever-  
 “ sible, can never admit of the least variation,” p. 20.  
 “ His counsels and designs stand firm and immoveable,  
 “ and can neither admit of alteration in themselves, nor  
 “ of hindrance in their execution,” p. 21. “ God will  
 “ certainly save all, whom he wills should be saved;  
 “ so he will as surely condemn all, whom he wills  
 “ should be condemned; for he is the Judge of the  
 “ whole earth, whose decree shall stand, and from  
 “ whose sentence there is no appeal,” p. 49. “ We  
 “ assert, that the number of the elect, and also of the  
 “ reprobate, is so fixt and determinate, that neither can  
 “ be augmented or diminished,” p. 55. “ The number,  
 “ as well of the elect, as of the reprobate, is fixt and  
 “ certain,” *ibid.* “ God does indeed precisely know to  
 “ A MAN, who are, and who are not, the objects of his  
 “ electing favour,” p. 56. “ If, between the elect and  
 “ reprobate, there was not a great gulph fixed, so that  
 “ neither can be otherwise than they are, then the will  
 “ of God (which is the alone cause why some are chosen  
 “ and

“ and others are not) would be rendered of no effect,” p. 57. “ God’s eternal love of some men, and hatred of others, is *immutable, and cannot be reversed*,” p. 58. “ Now God does, and will do, *nothing* but in consequence of his own decree,” p. 72. “ As the future faith and good works of the elect were *not the cause* of their being chosen; so neither were the future sins of the reprobate the *cause* of their being *past by*: but both the *choice* of the former, and the decretive *omission* of the latter, were owing, *merely and entirely*, to the sovereign will and determinating pleasure of God,” p. 73.—Thus much for the elect and reprobate in general. Let us now consider each of these in particular.

And, 1. With respect to the elect. Mr W. has supposed you to say, these shall be saved *do what they will*. That this is no misrepresentation of your meaning, abundantly appears from the following passages.

“ The *absolute will* of God is the *original spring* and *efficient cause* of his peoples salvation,” p. 16. “ Since this absolute will of God is both *immutable* and *omnipotent*; we infer, that the salvation of *every one* of the elect is most *infallibly certain*, and *can by no means be prevented*,” p. 17. Predestination, as relating to the elect, is, “ That *eternal, unconditional, particular, and irreversible* act of the divine will, whereby God *determined* within himself to deliver a *certain number* of ADAM’s degenerate offspring, out of that sinful and miserable estate, into which, by his primitive transgression, they were to fall,” p. 46. “ Those, who are ordained unto eternal life, were *not* so ordained on account of any *worthiness* foreseen in them, or of any *good works* to be wrought by them, nor yet, for their *future faith*: but *purely and solely*, of *free sovereign grace*, and according to the *mere pleasure* of God,” p. 58. “ Not *one* of the elect *can perish*, but they must *all necessarily* be saved,” p. 62. “ We do not speak at all improperly, when we say, that the salvation of his people is *necessary* and *certain*,” *ibid*. “ Their safety and *salvation* must be,

“ in

" in the *strictest sense* of the word, *necessary*," *ibid.*  
 " This steadfast and inevitable purpose of God *cannot*  
 " be *reversed* nor *disannulled* by any creature whatever,"  
 p. 63.

Now, Sir, let every impartial man judge, if the plain meaning of these passages is not this, " That the elect shall be saved do what they will ? "

2. With regard to the reprobate. Mr *W.* supposes you to say, that these shall be damned *do what they can*. And that this is no misrepresentation of your meaning, the following passages demonstrate. " The determinating will of God, being omnipotent, cannot be obstructed or made void ; it follows, that he *never did*, nor does he *now*, will that every individual of mankind should be saved," p. 10. " Neither is it *possible*, in the very nature of the thing, that they (the reprobate) should be elected to salvation, or ever obtain it, who God foreknew should perish : for then the divine act of preterition would be changeable, wavering and precarious ; the divine foreknowledge would be deceived ; and the divine will impeded. All which is impossible," p. 54. " Nor would his word be true, with regard to the non-elect, if it was *possible for them to be saved*," p. 56. " The condemnation of the reprobate is *necessary* and *irresistible*," p. 75.

Now, if the plain meaning of these words is not, That the reprobate shall be damned do what they can, words have no meaning at all.

We come, 3. To consider the necessity of believing this ; " Reader, believe this or be damned : Witness my hand, *A—T—*." That you have said this, in effect, in many parts of your pamphlet, the following quotations will abundantly evidence. " Without *predestination*, there *can be no Providence* ; and without *Providence*, there *can be no God* \*." Does it not follow of course, that unless we *believe* in predestination, we cannot believe in a Providence ; and that if we do not believe in a Providence, we cannot believe in a God ;

\* Preface, p. 16.



God; and may I not add, that unless we believe in a God, we cannot be saved? In other words, "He that does not believe in a Providence and in a God, shall be damned; But he that does not believe in Predestination, does not believe in a Providence or a God: Therefore, he that does not believe in Predestination, shall be damned."

Again, "Deny this, (that the will of God is the cause of *all things*) and you, at one stroke, destroy his *immutability* and *independency*," p. 9. "Add to this, that it evidently militates against the *majesty*, *omnipotence*, and *supremacy* of God, to suppose he can will any thing in vain," p. 11. "To say that God *absolutely nills* the *being* and *commission* of sin—is to represent the Deity as a *weak* and *impotent* being," p. 14.

Now, Sir, if to destroy the immutability and independence of God; to militate against his majesty, omnipotence and supremacy; and to represent him as a weak and impotent Being, are crimes which deserve damnation, and which will be punished with it; and if they who deny that the will of God is the cause of all things, and who say that he nills the being and commission of sin, are guilty of this crime; it must follow that they deserve damnation, and that, if they continue in such an error, they will be punished with it. I therefore leave it to any man to determine, if by attributing such evils unto us, as effectually consign us over to damnation, you have not said in effect, though not in so many words, "believe this or be damned!"

Again; Those who object to your doctrine, are "Men of corrupt minds," p. 19. But men of corrupt minds, we all know, shall be damned. Therefore, if we would not be men of corrupt minds; and so be damned, we must not object to your doctrine; or in other words, we must "believe it or be damned."

Again, "It is not in man's own power to believe himself such, (one of the elect) upon just grounds,

B

"till

" till he is enabled from above. But the elect shall  
 " be so enabled : they shall believe themselves to be  
 " what indeed they are ; as for the rest, who are not  
 " endued with faith, they shall perish ; raging and  
 " blaspheming as you do now : " (so you represent  
*Luther* speaking to *Erasmus*), p. 99. Here, you say,  
 1. That all who have true faith, believe themselves to  
 be unconditionally elected. 2. That those who do not  
 believe this, have no true faith. 3. They shall perish,  
 raging and blaspheming like *Erasmus* ! So that here  
 you have spoke out, " Believe this, or be damned."

Again, " The doctrine of predestination is not only  
 " useful, but *absolutely necessary* to be taught," *ibid.*  
 " Without it we cannot form *just and becoming ideas* of  
 " God," *ibid.* " Deny predestination, and you deny  
 " —the adorable perfections of God," p. 105 " The  
 " grace of God cannot be maintained without it," *ibid.*  
 " Without the doctrine of predestination, we cannot  
 " enjoy a lively sight and experience of God's special love  
 " and mercy towards us in CHRIST JESUS," p. 111.  
 " Without taking predestination into the account, ge-  
 " nuine morality and the performance of truly good works,  
 " will suffer, starve, and die away. The fuel of holy  
 " affection—*can only* be cherished, maintained and in-  
 " creased in the heart, by the sense and apprehension of  
 " God's predestinating love," p. 114. " Absolute re-  
 " signation can *only* flow from an absolute belief of,  
 " and an absolute acquiescence in, God's absolute  
 " providence, founded on absolute predestination,"  
 p. 120.

Now if it be so, that the doctrine of predestination  
 is *absolutely necessary* to be taught, because without it  
 we cannot form *just and becoming ideas* of God ; because  
 without it, we must deny his adorable perfections ; be-  
 cause without it, we cannot maintain the grace of God ;  
 because without it we cannot enjoy a lively sight and  
 experience of God's special love ; because without it,  
 genuine morality cannot be performed, and good works  
 will suffer, starve and die away ; because without it,  
 the

the fuel of holy affection *cannot* be *cherished*, or *maintained* in the heart; and because without it, there can be *no absolute resignation*; nothing can be plainer than the consequence, we *must* "BELIEVE this, or be "DAMNED."

I have now gone through each of the particulars contained in this paragraph, added by Mr *W.*; and have produced it from under *your hand*, Mr *A—T—*. "That the sum of all is this: One in twenty (suppose) "of mankind are elected; nineteen in twenty are re- "probated. The elect shall be *saved*, do what they "will; the reprobate shall be *damned*, do what they "can. Reader, believe this, or be damned!"

From all that has been said on this head, we learn how to answer your question, p. 5. "Have you quoted "me fairly?" I answer, Yes: and, for the truth of this answer, I appeal to the preceding account.

And now what becomes of your *decent* reflections? —"In almost any other case, you say, "a similar "forgery would transmit the criminal to *Virginia* or "Maryland, if not to *Tyburn*," p. 6. I hope you are not sorry that *this case* will not do it. You proceed, "If *such* "an opponent can be deemed an *honest* man, where shall "we find a *knave*?" How elegant is this! O, Sir, what a *pattern* of *patience* and *meekness* are you! Have you not given us too much reason to apply your own words to yourself? "Is it *thus*," Mr *Toplady*, that "you "contend for victory? Are *THESE* the weapons of "your warfare? Is *THIS* bearing down those who "differ from you with *meekness*? Do you call *THIS* "binding with *cords of love*? Away, for shame, with "such" — *scurrility*; and suppress such illiberal overflowings of a rancorous mind.

As the next paragraph is very extraordinary, and may shew how much your veracity is to be depended on, I shall set it down at large.

"And why should *you*, of all people in the world, "be so angry with the *doctrines of grace*? Forget not "the days and months that are past. Remember,



“ that it once depended on the toss of a shilling, whether you yourself should be a *Calvinist* or an *Arminian*. “ *Tails* fell uppermost, and you resolved to be an “ *Universalist*. It was an happy throw: for it con-  
 “ signed you over to the tents of *Arminius*. It saved  
 “ us from the company of a man, who, by a kind of  
 “ *religious gambling*, peculiarly his own, risked his  
 “ faith on the most contemptible of all *lots*: and was  
 “ capable of tossing up for his *creed*, as porters, or  
 “ chairmen, toss up for a *half-penny*,” p. 7.

Mr *W.* totally denies this story, and every part of it. I therefore call upon you to prove it. Till this is done, the story of the *splendid shilling* shall stand, as a *splendid* and *lasting* monument of your being a wilful *liar*: not only the *lover*, but the *maker* of a lie.

Again; You say, p. 8. “ But, even since this memorable *epocha*” (an *epocha* that never existed) “ you  
 “ have, by no means, proved yourself that *steady Ar-*  
 “ *minian*, you would have the world believe.” He  
 desires not the world to believe that he was, or was not  
 any *Arminian* at all. But as to the doctrines which he  
 teaches, few, very few, have been more *steady* therein  
 for between thirty and forty years.

You proceed. “ *Proteus* like, you disdain to be  
 “ shackled and circumscribed by any form. There  
 “ are times when you differ as much from your pre-  
 “ ceding self, as you do at all times from the rest of  
 “ mankind.” Does he at *all times* differ from the rest  
 of mankind? Then how comes it to pass, that at  
 one time he agrees with *Donatus*; at another with *Pe-*  
*lagius*; and at a third with *Arminius*! “ Possessed,”  
 you say, p. 9. “ of more than serpentine elability,  
 “ you cast your slough, not only once a year, but,  
 “ almost, once an hour.” This, Sir, is by no means  
 to be admitted without evidence. And therefore, if  
 you can prove what you have here so confidently asserted,  
 I call upon you to do it; or I shall set this down as an-  
 other instance of your total want of *veracity*. You still  
 go on. “ Hence, your innumerable *inconsistencies*, and  
 “ flagrant

“ flagrant self contradictions; the jarring of your principles (ever at intestine war with each other) and the incoherence of your religious system.” The preceding account demonstrates with what propriety you make this remark. Reconcile the inconsistencies, and self-contradictions, which are found in your own TWO OR THREE *poor pamphlets*; and I shall undertake to reconcile all the contradictions, that you shall find, in *an hundred volumes* of Mr W.’s “ *Evangelical truth* ” knows nothing of this *barlequin* assemblage. It is “ not, like *Joseph’s* coat, of many colours; — but is “ invariably simple, uniform, and harmonious.” — This is certainly *true* : And therefore, according to this rule, your doctrine is not *evangelical truth* : seeing, as I have demonstrated, it is *not invariably simple, uniform and harmonious*. But as to Mr W. whatever you may do, you have not yet proved that his doctrine is not invariably simple, uniform, and harmonious; and, therefore, you have not yet proved that it is *not evangelical truth*.

Again; “ On *one* occasion,” you say, “ you had “ the candour to own your levity, as to points of “ faith. I am acquainted with a very respectable person (Mr J. D.) who, many years ago, taking the “ freedom to tell you, that “ your prejudices, like “ armed men, stood, with their swords ready drawn, “ to—hew down every truth as fast as it presented itself to your mind;” you had the *unusual honesty* ” — *Honesty* ! *UNUSUAL honesty* ! I can scarce forbear saying, Thou *novice* ! Thou *hot-headed novice* ! be ashamed of calling Mr W. a KNAVE, at every turn ! — But, to return; “ You had,” you tell him, “ the unusual honesty to answer, Ah ! Sir ! if you knew how distressed I have been what doctrines I should embrace, and how I am *tossed about from system to system*, “ you would think me the most open to conviction, “ and the least liable to prejudice, of any man you “ ever knew.” This whole story is of a piece with the other. Mr W. denies every tittle of it : and I call upon

upon you and Mr J. D. (if such an one exists) either to prove it, or to stand convict of *making a lie*. "Why should you," you ask, "who have been so remarkably *tossed about*, take upon you to revile those who have been enabled to *stand fast*?" p. 10. I appeal to the many thousands who have known Mr W. from the beginning, if all this noise concerning his being "*so remarkably tossed about*;" and concerning his "*manifold shiftings from system to system*," is not an absolute *slander*. These know, that the system he set out with, about forty years ago, he has, in general, continued in to the present hour.

The eleventh page contains a most magnificent challenge: "Commence the siege," you say, "and welcome. Open your trenches, and plant your batteries. Bring forth your strong arguments, and play them off with vigor: I publicly profess, and subscribe my name to it, that if I cannot beat you back, I will freely capitulate, and own myself conquered." Dear, Sir, what a very *Hercules* you are! — But, Sir, I wish you may not forget the *frog in the fable*.

You go on; "This should you attempt to do, in a manner worthy of a Scholar and a Divine; I shall have no objection (if life and health continue) to measuring swords, or breaking a pike with you." What? Mr W. measuring swords, or breaking a pike with you! Indeed, Sir, you must first go to *Jericho*; and tarry there till your beard grows. Then, should Mr W. be alive, and have *nothing else to do, perhaps*, he may condescend to some such thing. But in the mean time, the *most* you have to *expect* or *fear*, is the *rod* or the *ferula*.

Again, you say, p. 12. "I have no notion of encountering a *windmill*, in lieu of a *giant*." Is it possible, Mr *Toplady*, that you can be so vain, as to imagine you are capable of encountering giants? But you go on. "If, therefore, you come against me (as now) with straws, instead of artillery; and with chaff, in the room of ammunition; I shall disdain to give you  
"battle:



" battle: I shall only laugh at you from the ramparts." *Dread Sir*, how big you talk! What a desperado in your own eyes! Clad with impenetrable brass; armed with deadly steel; and fortified in the castle of your own importance! With killing flames in your eyes; and the sound of slaughter thundering from your tongue! You stand on your battlements ready to encounter the most gigantic foe! What wonder, then, that *you*, the first-born of *Mars*! should *disdain* to give battle to such a *pigmy* as *Mr W.*! Nay, would it not be too great condescension for *you* to laugh at *him*, from your ramparts!

O *Mr Toplady*! how are you changed from what you were a little while ago, when a student in the college of *Dublin*! Then you thought it an honour, if a *lay preacher* belonging to *Mr W.* would permit you to sit at his feet for instruction. But now you are become such a literary hero, that, you say of *Mr W.* himself, " I would no more enter into a formal controversy, with such a scribbler, than I would contend for the wall with a chimney-sweeper." What an honour to *Dr G.* that he has been able, in so short a time, so thoroughly to compleat a most humble admirer! and to make him, (*from his heart*) so great an admirer, not of the *Anabaptists*! but of the church of *England*!

As to what you have said, most elegant Sir! (p. 13.) of " the *Mouse*—not cheap, at a penny;" and that you are *VERY apprehensive*—" the *Rat*—will be far too dear at a groat;" I have nothing to say: and therefore, I shall leave the decision of this important matter to your own learned disquisition.

*Ibid.* " Hitherto," you say, " your treatment of *Zanchius* resembles that of some clumsy, bungling Anatomist: who, in the dissection of an animal, dwells much on the larger and more obvious particulars; but quite omits the nerves, the muscles, and the most interesting parts of the complicated machine." It, rather, resembles the Anatomist, who by shewing the head and the heels of an *Ass*, convinces us, that he is not dissecting an *Elephant*. " Thus,"

you say, "in your piddling extract, you only give a few of the larger *outlines*; without at all entering into the spirit of the subject, or so much as *producing* (so far from attempting to *refute*) any of the turning points, on which the argument depends." This, Sir, is not true: For he has, 1. Given us the definitions of your terms. 2. All your propositions. 3. Many of your explications. And, 4. Not a small quantity of that which you call, *proof*. And in doing this, he has done quite sufficient. Any one, by reading his extract, will easily discern, "the spirit of the subject," (yea, and of its author too!) — and "the turning points on which the argument depends:" *viz.* That "God is the author of sin! — That whatever is, is right\*." — "That a small remnant shall be irresistibly saved — But, as to all the rest, that God has, unchangeably, irresistibly, and unconditionally

" Consign'd their unborn souls to hell,  
" And damn'd them from their mother's womb."

Yea, damned them, from all eternity! Now, was Mr Wesley with great formality, and deep deliberation, to sit down to weigh arguments brought in support of such positions; and, more especially, when they are brought with all your *meekness* and *candour*! with all your *fear* and *trembling*! and with all your *deference* to superior *age* and *learning*! In such a case, his conduct would have the same degree of propriety, as if he were very gravely, to consider arguments brought to prove that your head and shoulders reach the moon: or, (what is equally impossible to be believed) that, you are a meek and humble man.

Page 14. "When I advert," you say, "to the unjust and indecent manner, in which you attacked the late excellent Mr Hervey; above all, when I consider how daringly free you have made with the *Scriptures themselves*, both in your *Commentaries* and in your *Alterations* of the Text itself; I cease to wonder  
" at

\* Preface, p. 14.

“ at the audacious licentiousness of your pen, respecting  
 “ me.” As to the controversy between Mr *W.* and Mr  
*Hervey*, read Mr *Sellon's* answer to those scurrilous Let-  
 ters; and then judge whether Mr *W.* or Mr *Hervey* had  
 reason to complain.

But you say, he has “ made daringly free with the  
 “ Scriptures both in his Commentaries, and in his  
 “ Alterations of the text itself.” As to his Commenta-  
 ries, all candid persons allow, that they are wrote with  
 modesty and self-diffidence: And as to the Text itself  
 he has made no other alterations but what all critics and  
 commentators are allowed to do: That is, he has now  
 and then endeavoured to bring the translation a little  
 nearer the original. If this is making *daringly free*  
 with the scripture, then you yourself are not clear:  
 as your alterations of 1 *Tim.* iv. 10. in your translation,  
 p. 32. and of *Mark* xvi. 15. p. 91. and of *Matth.* xx.  
 23. p. 93. and of *John* xii. 40. and of *Acts* iv. 28. and  
*chap.* xiii. 48. p. 95. and of 1 *Pet.* ii. 8, 9. p. 97. and  
 of 2 *Pet.* i. 10. and several other places, demonstrate.

Page 15. You ask, “ Which of our antient divines  
 “ have you not evaporated and spoiled? And made  
 “ them speak a language, when dead; which they  
 “ would have started from. with horror, when alive?”  
 Pray, Sir, which of them has he so treated? I know of  
 none. If you do, point out their names: and shew us,  
 fairly, wherein he has made them speak a language  
 when dead; which they did not speak when living. It is  
 true, in collecting his CHRISTIAN LIBRARY, from the  
 writings of antient divines, which he intended to be a  
 Repository of Practical Divinity ONLY, he has passed by,  
 as foreign to his plan, every thing of a controversial  
 nature. In consequence, he has passed by every thing  
 about unconditional Election and Reprobation. And  
 as these are points which have so often exhilarated your  
 spirits; as the idea of a *few only* going to heaven, has  
 so often been a cordial to your mind; and as the glori-  
 ous view of myriads upon myriads, going irresistibly to  
 eternal death, has so often overwhelmed you with joy  
 and transport! it stings you to the quick! it cuts you



to the heart ! to think that such soul-reviving doctrines should, on *any occasion*, be omitted.

*Ibid.* “ I wish you to keep your hands,” you say, “ from literary picking and stealing.” Picking and stealing ! Good Sir ! suppress your fears ! whoever else is in danger, *you* are not. When you have produced any thing worth stealing, we will give you leave to be apprehensive of danger ; and to admonish Mr *W.* As to what he has already done, in your case, be not so vain as once to imagine, that it was done in a way of stealing from *you*. Indeed, Sir, it was not. Mr *W.* took up your performance, only to expote it to view ; that the beholder might laugh at, and shun it.

Page 16. “ On most occasions,” you say, “ you “ are too prone to set up your own infallible judgment, as the very *lapis lydius* of right and wrong. “ Hence the firebrands, arrows and death, which “ you hurl at those who presume to vary from the “ oracles you dictate.” I know of no firebrands, arrows and death, which he hurls, but what every faithful shepherd ought to hurl, in the defence of his sheep. It is true, when either himself, his people, or his doctrine, are assaulted ; he, often, thinks it his duty to make some defence. And, as in doing this, he has sometimes to do with persons, like you, who are *wiser in their own eyes, than seven men who can render a reason* ; after taking care to avoid falsehood, rudeness and scurrility, he frequently treats them without much ceremony. But to say that he is *severe, censorious, or inflammatory*, either in his conversation, preaching, or writing, is as great an untruth, as if I was to say, that you are the most gentle and patient man in the world.

But you proceed “ Hence, particularly, your ill- “ liberal and malevolent spleen against the Protestant “ Dissenters.” This is as false as it is invidious. I defy you to prove the least degree of it. The passage you have produced out of his *Preservative*, proves no such thing. All it proves is that Mr *W.* approves of *some things* in the church of *England*, more than of *some things* among the Dissenters ; and that he is desirous  
every

every Methodist preacher should do the same \*. And what wonder if he prefers the doctrines and discipline of the church of *England*, in general, to that of the Dissenters; seeing he was born and bred in that church, and ordained a Minister of it? Yet there are not many Ministers in the church of *England*, who have not said ten times more against the Dissenters than Mr *W.* has done; and, on the other hand, are there not many Ministers among the Dissenters, who have not said ten times more against the Church?

The passage from Mr *W.*'s Letter to a *Roman Catholic*, which you contrast with the above passage, respecting the Dissenters, in order to demonstrate, "How much more *politely*, not to say *cordially*, this Gentleman " shakes hands with the Papists," is a sad proof of your want of candour. I would ask here; 1. Do you, or do you not, insinuate that Mr *W.* approves of, and esteems the Papists more than the Protestant Dissenters; 2. Do you, or do you not, know in your conscience, that it is not so? Yet 3. Do you not want the world in general, and the Dissenters in particular, to believe otherwise? O Truth! O Candour! what a friend have you in Mr *Toplady*?

But you say, "Far be it from me, to charge Mr *W.* " with a fondness for *all* the grosser parts of Popery." A fondness, do you say, for *all* the grosser parts of Popery! Pray Sir, by what medium do you prove, that he *has*, or *ever had*, a fondness for *any* of the grosser parts of Popery? or for *any* part of it, as it stands opposed to Protestantism? Dear Mr *Toplady*, you will give me leave, with all freedom to ask; Is this an Instance of your being a *Fool* or a *Knave*? Is it through ignorance that you talk about "the partition between " that church and him being somewhat *thinner* than " might be wished?" If this is the case, then what a learned Divine you are? But if you know better, and yet talk thus; (which I fear is the case) then, what a worthy saint are you!

As

\* See Mr *W.*'s *Preservative*, p. 244.

As to *bigotry*, I acknowledge, you have said many good things. But what pity there is not somebody else to say them for you? For according to the accounts, of friends and enemies, you are already in your little way, one of the greatest bigots of the age. Nay, *so great a bigot for Predestination are you; that, to my knowledge, even bigoted Predestinarians cannot bear you.* It is therefore intolerable to hear you say, *page 17.* “Candour, benevolence, and forbearance, become “smothered and extinguished,” by bigotry; unless you had immediately added, “God be merciful to me “a sinner!” But right or wrong, you will go on. “Bi-  
“gotry—by limiting the extent of *moderation* and mu-  
“tual *good will*, tears up *charity* by the very roots.” MODERATION! GOOD-WILL! CHARITY! How *deep-ly* you are concerned for *these*, let all who have heard your Sermons, and seen your Writings declare. “In short,” you say, “Bigotry is the very *essence* of Popery.” I doubt that: I am inclined to think, that it is only a *property* of it. “And, too often,” you say, “leads “its votaries, before they are aware, into the bosom “of that pretended church.” Then I beseech you, dear Sir, to take care in time.

*Page 18.* “You have, obliquely, given *me* a sneer-  
“ing lecture upon *modesty*, *self-diffidence*, and *tendernefs*  
“to opponents.” He has, and a very seasonable lec-  
ture too, if you did but know it. “Why do you re-  
“present me as telling my readers, that they must,  
“upon pain of damnation, believe, that only one per-  
“son in twenty is elected?” He has not represented  
you as saying so. His Words are, “One in twenty  
(*suppose*) of mankind are elected.” By adding the word,  
*only*, and by leaving out the word, *suppose*, you have  
quite perverted his meaning. Again, you ask, “Why  
“do you introduce me, as enjoining them to believe  
“under the same penalty, that the elect shall be saved,  
“do what they WILL, and the reprobate damned, do  
“what they CAN?” Why? Because you have said  
this, in various expressions, perhaps not less than an  
*hundred* times over.

*Ibid.*



*Ibid.* “ I believe and preach, that the chosen and  
 “ ransomed of the LORD are appointed to salvation  
 “ through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the  
 “ truth.” Very true. But do you not mean, that,  
 both in the appointment to salvation, and in the sancti-  
 fication of the Spirit and belief of the truth, they are  
 wrought upon as mere machines? Do you not mean  
 that *all this* is wrought in them, *irresistibly*? If so, it  
 follows, that they are appointed, first, to obtain salva-  
 tion; and, secondly, to obtain the sanctification of the  
 Spirit and belief of the truth, “ *do what they will.*”  
 If this is not your meaning, tell us, if you can, what  
 it is; or else acknowledge, that you are BAWLING with  
 your head in a BAG.

“ And, with regard to the reprobate,” you say,  
 “ you believe and preach, that they will be condemn-  
 “ ed, not for doing what they can in a moral way,  
 “ but for *not* doing what they can: for *not* believing  
 “ the gospel report; and for *not* ordering their conver-  
 “ sation according to it.” They will be condemned,  
 you say, for *not* doing what they *can*! If “ *whatsoever*  
 “ *comes to pass, comes to pass necessarily;*” if *whatever*  
*man does, he does necessarily*\*: I would be glad to know  
 what they *can* do, otherwise than what they actually  
 do? If it is not “ possible, in the very nature of the  
 “ thing, that they should be elected to salvation, or  
 “ ever obtain it †;” CAN they do any thing *so* as to  
 be elected to salvation, or ever obtain it? Again; If  
 “ the decrees of election and reprobation are *immu-*  
 “ *table and irreversible* ||;” CAN the reprobate do any  
 thing *so* as to reverse the decree of reprobation? Once  
 more: If “ the condemnation of the reprobate is *ne-*  
 “ *cessary and inevitable* §;” CAN they do any thing *so*  
 as to *escape* it? If they *can* do any thing of this kind; if  
 they *can* do any thing besides what they are *irresistibly*  
 compelled to do; be so kind, good Sir, as to tell us  
 what it is?

Why

\* Translation of Zanebuis, p. 14.

† Ibid. 54.

|| Ibid. 56.

§ Page 75.

Why you say, "They are condemned for *not* believing " the gospel report; and for *not* ordering their conversation according to it." So now the *gordian knot* is untied! The reprobate, for whom CHRIST *did not die*, are condemned, for *not believing* that he *did* die for them! The persons who have *no* lot or part in the gospel report, are condemned for *not believing* that *they have*! Why then, according to *you*, they are condemned for not believing a lie!

Again, The reprobate "will be condemned — for " *not believing* the gospel report; and for *not ordering* their conversation according to it." That is, the reprobate, who are under an *irresistible necessity* of *not believing* the gospel report; and who are under the *same necessity* of *not ordering* their conversation according to it; are condemned BECAUSE they do not thus believe and order their conversation, *notwithstanding this irresistible necessity to the contrary*! Exquisitely CLEAR!

Page 19. "Let me ask you," you say, "when, or " where I ever presumed to ascertain the number of " God's elect?" And let me ask you where, or when Mr W. said you did? "The Book of Life is not in " *your* keeping, nor in *mine*." Perhaps it is not the worse for Mr W. that it is not in *yours*: if it was, I fear there would be need of an irresistible decree to keep his name in it.

Page 20. "Declarations of this tremendous nature" (that ~~few~~ shall be saved)—"should—bring you on " your knees before God, with your hand upon your " breast, and this cry in your lips." If all in heaven and in earth, were to spend a million of ages on their knees before God, this, according to your notion, would not add one soul to the number of those who shall be saved; seeing it could not reverse the irresistible decree. And as to our praying that God may shew us "to which class we belong;" this is, on your supposition, a very dangerous prayer: For if not, only, nineteen out of twenty are reprobated; but, as some think,

think, *ninety-nine* out of an *hundred*; then it is *ninety-nine* to one we shall get such an answer to our prayer, as will cause us to choose *strangling rather than life*: it will be *ninety-nine* to one, but we shall see that we belong to the class of reprobates, and so we shall be *tormented before our time*. Prayer, therefore, in such a case, and on such a supposition, is not only useless, but also the most dangerous employment in the world.

*Ibid.* "Should the holy Spirit vouchsafe to lead you thus far;" (namely, as to have "that faith which is of divine operation) you will, then, no longer object, that the elect shall be saved, do what they will." Most charitable Sir! Do you not here strongly intimate that, as yet, Mr *W.* is not possessed of the faith of divine operation? — That the holy Spirit has not yet vouchsafed to lead him thus far? O Sir! if the *tree* is to be *known* by its *fruits*; and if *faith* is to be *known* (NOT by *bawling* about *opinions*, but) by its *works*; how *doubtful* is it whether the holy Spirit has led you *thus far*?

Permit me to give a short account from an eye and ear-witness: the truth of which, thousands can attest. This account, with a little alteration, is as follows: "With respect to Mr *W.*—his very *enemies* must allow, that his labours are very extraordinary. His catalogue gives an account of near an HUNDRED AND SEVENTY different pieces, which he has published, in about thirty years: a single article of which is, *A Christian Library* of FIFTY VOLUMES. Two others are *Explanatory Notes on the Old and New TESTAMENT*, in four large quarto volumes. His public Discourses, consisting of Sermons and Exhortations, are about twenty in a week; upwards of a THOUSAND in a year. The number of Letters which he writes, is considerably greater. Visiting the Sick, and the Distressed, is another constant part of his employment. His travelling, chiefly on *horse-back*, cannot be much less than five thousand miles every year.—And thus he has laboured, not only for a few weeks or months, but for above *thirty* years to-  
gether."



“ gether : and that steadily and constantly too, both  
 “ by night and by day ; notwithstanding all the dis-  
 “ couragements he has met with. And, what is still  
 “ more remarkable, though he is now drawing near  
 “ to the age of *Seventy* ; he is so far from *diminishing*,  
 “ or from *abating* any of his labours, that he is conti-  
 “ nually increasing them.”

Now, while he is thus spending his time and strength,  
 for the welfare of mankind ; while he is travelling  
 both by sea and by land, with *storms* and *tempests*  
*bleak in his teeth* ; how easy is it, for any Gentleman,  
 (possessing all the comforts of life) to sit in an easy  
 chair, and animadvert, *with great solemnity* ! on his  
 conduct \* ? How easy is it for the Reverend Mr  
*Toplady*, Vicar of *Broad Hembury*, to sit at his fire-  
 side ; and, very magnificently, to represent Mr *W.* as  
 a downright reprobate !

That you have done this, the passage before us  
 evinces. I shall lay it before the reader, with a short  
 paraphrase, that he may judge for himself. “ Should  
 “ the Holy Spirit”—in any future period—“ vouch-  
 “ safe to lead you thus far”—that is, give you (what  
 he has *not yet* given you) “ the faith of divine opera-  
 “ tion—you will then no longer be ready to object”—  
 like an unbeliever, as you now are, “ that the elect shall  
 “ be saved, do what they will ; for you will”—then  
 “ know by heartfelt experience”—what, for want of  
 that experience, *you cannot now* know—“ that the  
 converted elect”—of which number you are not—“ are  
 “ and cannot but be, ambitious to perform all those  
 “ good works, in which God hath ordained them to  
 “ walk.” Now, if this does not exclude Mr *W.* from  
 the number of *believers*, I know not what can.

I cannot dismiss these words without observing, that  
 your divinity is no less remarkable here than your can-  
 dour. For, you say, “ the converted elect *are*, and  
 “ *must be* ambitious, to perform all the good works, in  
 “ which God hath ordained them to walk.” Your  
 meaning certainly is, that the converted elect are *so*  
*powerfully*

\* Reply, &c. p. 19.

powerfully influenced by an internal principle of grace, as thereby, to be necessarily constrained to the performance of these works. This is what all predestinarians say on the head.

But if so, if they are thus necessarily constrained to perform all those good works, whence is it that all the converted elect do not perform all those works, at all times, and on all occasions? Whence was it, in particular, that *Noah* was not restrained from drunkenness; and *Lot* from incest; and *David* from murder and adultery; and *Peter* from denying his master? And whence was it that you, Mr *Toplady*, (who, to be sure! are one of the converted elect,) were not restrained from card-playing, and also from telling the Rev. Mr *E*— that you saw no harm therein? And once more, Whence was it that this grace did not restrain you from all that self-sufficiency, pertness, impatience, and scurrility, which you have so remarkably displayed, in your Epistle to Mr *W*.? Will you say, “that all this is owing to a principle of corruption; which principle, remaining in the converted elect, necessitates them to fall short in every part of their obedience?” If so; then I shall be glad to know how these two principles, essentially opposite to each other, act in conjunction with each other; the one in constraining the converted elect, “To perform all those good Works,” and the other in constraining them to fall short in every branch of that performance? I shall be glad to know the precise manner how these opposite principles act in conjunction, in necessitating the converted elect, both to stand and fall at one and the same time!

Again; If the converted elect are under such a necessity of “performing all those good works, in which God hath ordained them to walk;” I am at a loss to understand the propriety of St *Paul*’s words to *Titus*: *I will, that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works?* Now, if they which have believed in God, will and must, from an internal constraint, maintain good works; what need is there of their being careful to maintain them?

or

or what need that *Titus* should affirm this constantly ? or what need that *Paul* should will, or desire it of him ? If they “ cannot *but* be ambitious to perform all those “ good works ? ” *Paul* might have saved himself, and *Titus*, yea, and the converted elect too, an unnecessary trouble.—To make use of many external means, and to employ much labour therein towards the performance of those works, which, from another cause, namely, from inherent principles, are unavoidable ; is, as unnecessary, as to use many external means, and to employ much labour, to cause light and heat to proceed from the sun ; or to cause a body to tend to the center : or, which is nearly the same, to cause Mr *Toplady* to be vain and scurrilous !

Nor can I see that, on your supposition, there is any need of nineteen out of twenty parts of the word of God. For if the converted elect WILL, spontaneously, and MUST of necessity, “ do all those good works ; ” What need is there of exhortations, commands, warnings, threatnings ? If an inward principle of grace makes the believer an involuntary agent, in what he does ; or, rather, a kind of machine ; I can see no more propriety in exhorting or commanding him to obedience, than there would be, if I was to exhort or command this pen to write !

Come, then, you great master of investigation ! and clear this point of all its difficulties. Open your magazine of casuistical divinity, and shew us how it is that this necessity of performing all the will of God, which converted elect are supposed to be under, is consistent with that other necessity, they are supposed to be under, of not performing it. Then shew us, secondly, how this internal necessity is consistent with the necessity of that external endeavour, which the converted elect were to be careful to perform ; and with the necessity, which *Titus* was under, of affirming it CONSTANTLY ; and with the necessity which St *Paul* was under, of desiring, and requesting this of him. And, thirdly, shew us, how it is consistent with the necessity, or propriety, either of giving or receiving commands, warnings, threatnings,



threatnings, exhortations, or the like ! If you can, clear up all these difficulties, and reconcile these contradictions, you will be a workman indeed.

*Ibid.* " Your pretended fear of *Antinomianism*, like " your real fear of the comet, which was expected to " have appeared, a few years back, is perfectly idle " and chimerical." Whatever his fear, concerning the comet was (another piece of history which wants proof); it is certainly well grounded concerning the danger of *Antinomianism*. For if ἀντὶ νόμου, (from which the term *Antinomianism* is derived) signifies to be *against the law*; and if this, (according to the common acceptation of the words in the Christian theology) signifies to be against the performance of the Christian law, as it is a law; then his fear of *Antinomianism* being introduced by your doctrine, is neither " idle nor " chimerical: " because it is certain that your doctrine, and *Antinomianism*, are inseparable. To make this appear, let me ask, 1. As to that which is commonly called *the law of CHRIST*, do you believe that it is a law, strictly and properly ? Do you believe that it has all the essential properties of a law ? That is, that it is *enjoined* by *CHRIST*, as a law-giver; that the obedience required of us to it, is, properly, the obedience of a subject to a law; that this obedience is enforced by the sanctions of rewards and punishments, as sanctions of a law ? Is not this the way that the law of *CHRIST* ought to be insisted on, if you would insist on it, as it is a law ? If so, do you, and all *Predestinarians* (who are consistent with themselves) thus represent it ? *See* you not, rather, exclaim against this as *legality* ? *See* you not set yourself, might and main, against the notion of *obedience*, as it is a *DUTY* required by *CHRIST* of us; and, as enforced by promises of rewards, and threatnings of punishments ? If so; then you are plainly *against the law*; in other words, you are an *Antinomian*.

But you may say, (what is commonly said) that although you do not represent the duties of the gospel, under the notion of the duties of a law; and though  
you

you do not represent the performance of those duties under the notion of legal performances ; yet you effectually secure the performance of them by such a representation of the grace of God, as will not fail to beget love ; which love will constrain to universal obedience. Let it be granted, for the present, that you do represent the grace of God as begetting love ; and that this love does, in a way of gratitude, constrain the believer to perform all the duties of the gospel ; yet, this does in no wise acquit you from the charge of Antinomianism. To obey a person we love, because we *love* him, and *choose* to obey him ; and to obey a person because he has regal authority over us, and because it is our duty to obey him, are quite different things. Were you to obey the King of *England*, because you love him and choose to obey him, without regarding his regal capacity, or the laws by which he demands your obedience ; especially, if you exclaimed against obeying him on these accounts, your love to his person, and the obedience resulting therefrom, would not acquit you from the charge of being *ἀντὶ νόμων*, *against the laws of England* ; or, in other words, it would not acquit you of the charge of being a civil or political Antinomian. In like manner, if you obey the KING of heaven, because you *love* him, and *choose* to obey him ; without regarding his regal capacity, or the laws by which he requires your obedience ; especially, if you exclaim against obeying him on the last accounts, your love to his person, and the obedience resulting therefrom, will not acquit you of the charge of being *against the law* of heaven : or, in other words, it will not excuse you from the charge of theological Antinomianism.

But you may again say, (what is also commonly said)  
 “ that, of all the men in the world, Predestinarians  
 “ cannot be called Antinomians, because in their doctrine of imputed righteousness, they insist on the absolute necessity of fulfilling the law, and that perfectly ; and, likewise, that this was done, personally,  
 “ by CHRIST, and, in him, by us, to whom it is imputed.”

“puted.” That is, in other words; Although the Predestinarians exclaim against a personal fulfilling of the law, yet they cannot be called Antinomians; seeing they insist on a perfect fulfilling of it in CHRIST! Is it not astonishing, that such a quibble should ever be thought on, to evade the charge of Antinomianism! A quibble which gives up the whole point, which allows the whole indictment? For, does not all the world know, that by an Antinomian is always meant; a person who denies the necessity of a *personal fulfilling* of the law, by a believer; because CHRIST is supposed to have done it for him? “CHRIST kept the Law: therefore I need not.”

From what has been said, we learn, 1. That consistent Predestination and Antinomianism, are the very same thing. 2. That Mr W.’s fear of it, in you and your friends is not “idle or chimerical.” 3. That your remark, p. 22. “Mr W.’s Tenet of sinless perfection, “leads directly to the grossest Antinomianism,” is truly idle and chimerical.

With regard to this last point; I would observe, that by *Perfection* he means, “the loving God with “all our heart, and our neighbour as ourselves;” the being “holy in all manner of conversation, as he who “hath called us is holy, and the doing this because “God hath commanded it.” Now, Sir, I beg to know how this tenet *leads directly*, to Antinomianism? Nay, how it leads, either *directly* or *indirectly* thereto? If this cannot be done, will it not be a great argument of your being either *very wise* or else, *very honest*!

Your stories concerning I know not what Lady, and concerning some of Mr W.’s quondam followers, if true which I much doubt, are no proof that his doctrine of perfection, leads to Antinomianism: They only prove that this, as well as any other scriptural doctrine, may be abused.

Page 23. “You formed a scheme,” you tell Mr W. “of collecting as many perfect ones as you could, to “live together under one roof. A number of those “flowers were accordingly transplanted from your nursery  
“sery



“ sery-beds, to the *hot-house*. And a hot-house it soon  
 “ proved. For, would we believe it? The *sinless* peo-  
 “ ple quarrelled, in a short time, at so violent a rate,  
 “ that you found yourself forced to disband the select  
 “ regiment.” This story is *very circumstantially* related,  
 and yet is wholly *false in every circumstance*. No such  
 thing was ever done: no such thing was ever attempt-  
 ed: no such thing was ever designed. If you can prove  
 the contrary, do it; or else, I fix this upon you, *That*  
*you are a publisher of lies*. Prove *this point* then by sub-  
 stantial evidence, or else, lie under *this odium* for ever.

*Ibid.* You observe, “ That how few soever they (the  
 “ elect) may appear and really be in a single genera-  
 “ tion, and as balanced with the many unrighteous  
 “ among whom they live below; yet, when the whole  
 “ number of the Redeemer’s jewels is made up—they  
 “ will amount to *an exceeding great multitude which no*  
 “ *man can number*.” After this, you say, *p. 24.* “ Go  
 “ now, Sir, and dazzle the credulous with your mock  
 “ victory over the supposed reprobation of nineteen in  
 “ twenty.” Do not quibble, Mr *Toplady*, do not play  
 upon words. Every one, who has a single grain of  
 common sense, sees, that by these words, “ nineteen  
 “ in twenty” (suppose) Mr *W.* only meant what you  
 have just now allowed; *viz.* that the elect are but *few*,  
 “ in a single generation, and as balanced with the many  
 “ unrighteous among whom they live.”

“ Go on,” you say, “ to chalk hideous figures on  
 “ your wainscot; and enjoy the glorious triumph of  
 “ battering your knuckles in fighting them. But fa-  
 “ ther no more of your hideous figures on *me*.” Mighty  
 pretty! But you acknowledge, at least, that the figures  
 which represent the eternal, unchangeable, and uncon-  
 ditional, reprobation of nineteen out of twenty; that is,  
 of a number which is very great, when compared to the  
*few* elect, in each generation, are “ hideous figures.”  
 Such they are indeed! But is it not really astonishing,  
 that you should disown them? You write a whole chap-  
 ter on reprobation; you vehemently insist on it all  
 over your Tract! And, after all, are so *case-hardened*,

as to exclaim against Mr *W.* for "fathering it upon you." With inimitable confidence you say, "Do not dress up scarecrows of your own, and then affect to run away from them as mine."—*Scare-crows* do you say! verily these doctrines are enough to *scare* even to *distraction* all in *heaven*, and *earth*, and *hell*. "But do not then affect to run away from them as mine." Whose are they then? *yours most certainly*; and he who runs away from them the *soonest* and the *fastest*, is unquestionably the wisest man.

*Ibid.* "I do not expect," you say, "to be treated, by Mr *John Wesley*, with the meekness and candour of a Christian; but I wish him, for his own reputation's sake, to write and act with the honesty of an Heathen." O the *meekness* of your spirit! O the *candour* with which you write! And "you wish him, for his own reputation sake"—(How *deeply* are you concerned for his reputation! and how *sincere* are your wishes on this account)—"to write and act, with the honesty of an Heathen!" But do you seriously believe he has the honesty of an Heathen? if not, how can he write and act with *that* he has not? Dear Mr *Toplady*, let me for once indulge a wish: and that is, That you may know what manner of spirit you are of! Then you will be deeply ashamed of that unparalleled superciliousness, which you have so largely displayed on this and other occasions.

*Ibid.* "You would choose," you say, "to be deemed a Minister of the National Church." He does; and he is, and has long been a Minister of it: As such, whenever he has an opportunity of serving it, he gladly embraces it, so far as he can with a good conscience. Can any one do more than this? Do you Mr *Toplady*, do as much? "Why then," you ask, "do you decry her *doctrines*, and, as far as in you lies, sap her discipline?" He does not decry her doctrines so much as you do. To make this appear, let any one, 1. Take a view of the doctrines of the National Church, as a regular and well-connected system contained in *all* her Articles, in *all* her Homilies, in *all* her Rubrics, and

in

in *all* her forms of Worship, and as it has been understood and explained by the clergy *in general*, ever since the Reformation 2. Let him take a view of Mr *W*'s doctrine as contained in his *Appeals* and *Sermons*, and of yours, as contained in your translation of *Zanchius*. Then, 3. Let him compare both with the doctrines of the Church, and he will see which of you decries them most.

Your calling his doctrine of the intermediate state of departed souls, a "new-fangled doctrine," shews what a new-fangled divine you are. For, as we are told by Mr *Sellon*, "Thus thought the pious and learned Bishop *Bull*; thus thought the learned and pious Dr *Doddridge*; and thus thought, says the learned Dr *Whitby*, *all the ancient Christians* \*."

Your note at the bottom of p. 25. is a farther proof of your great candour and impartiality. "In Mr *W*'s first Edition of his *Notes on the New Testament*,"—are the two following assertions,—“Enoch and Elijah are not in heaven, but only in paradise. Note on *John* iii. 13. *Enoch and Elijah entered at once into the highest degree of glory without first waiting in paradise.*” Note on *Rev.* xix. 20. When it is observed, first, that many of his notes are borrowed from different authors, secondly that at the time he wrote on the New Testament, he was daily employed about many other things; (not to speak of his ill state of health at that time, being supposed to be in a galloping consumption) no man of sense will wonder that such a mistake should pass unnoticed. But Mr *Toplady*, how will you reconcile it with justice and candour, that you have not given the least intimation of this mistake being rectified in the other editions! O blush, if you can blush! And no more complain of *misrepresentation* and *injustice*!

*Ibid.* “That you, likewise do not overflow with zeal for the discipline of the Church of England, is manifest, not only from the numerous and intricate regulations with which you fetter your Societies, but from the measures you so lately pursued, when a certain

\* Answer to *Hervey's Eleven Letters*, p. 101.



“ tain foreign *Mendicant* was in *England*, who went  
 “ by the name of *Erasmus*, and stiled himself Bishop  
 “ of *Arcadia*.”

Whereinsoever Mr *W.* may vary from the discipline of the Church, it is not through *choice* but *necessity*. The Church doors were first thrown in his face, before he took a single irregular step. And it is observable, that the reasons why the Church doors were shut against him were, 1. The multitudes who came to hear him. 2. His adhering to her doctrines and appointments, more rigidly than most Clergymen now alive.

As to the “ Numerous, and intricate regulations, with which, you say, he fetters his societies ;” they are only a few plain, simple rules concerning avoiding evil, doing good, and using the means of grace, plainly deduced from Scripture ; and what you and every Clergyman in *England*, may take the benefit of, if you please.

As to *Erasmus*, there is no room to doubt of his being a Bishop. Dr J— wrote to the Patriarch of *Smyrna*, who gave it under his hand, that *Erasmus* was Bishop of *Arcadia* in *Crete*. And that he is the identical person, was proved, from the testimony of several Gentlemen, who had seen him in *Turkey*.

Page 26. “ With regard to this person,” you say, “ I shall take the liberty of putting one or two plain questions to you. Did you, or did you not, get him to ordain several of your lay-preachers, according to the *Greek* ritual ?” He got him to ordain Dr J—, but did not *desire* him to do it according to the *Greek* ritual, in particular, as you unfairly insinuate. 2. Did *these lay preachers* of yours, or did they not, both dress and officiate, as Clergymen of the Church of *England* ? The Doctor did dress, but, strictly speaking, did not *officiate* as a Clergyman of the Church of *England* : He rather officiated as an assistant to Mr *W.* in preaching and administering the Lord’s supper in his Societies. “ Putting matters at the best,” you say, “ they could only be Ministers of the *Greek* Church, which could give them no legal right to act as Ministers of the Church of *England*.” You are sadly  
 C mistaken.

mistaken. Whoever is episcopally ordained, is a Minister of the Church universal, and as such has a right to officiate in any part of the globe. This all Episcopalians, who understand their own Doctrines, know. Hence it is that the Church of *England* frequently employs, without re-ordination, priests ordained even by *Popish* Bishops.

You go on, "Did you not repeatedly declare, that their ordination was, to all intents and purposes, as valid as *your own*?" Yes. And this is no more than what any Bishop in *England* will acknowledge, even of a *popish* priest. 3. "Did you, or did you not *strongly* press this supposed Greek Bishop to consecrate you a Bishop at large?"—I have authority to answer, No, never at all. But suppose he had? Where would have been the blame? Mr *W.* is connected with a number of persons, who have given every proof which the nature of the thing allows, that they have an *inward call* to preach the Gospel. Both he, and they would be glad if they had an *outward call* too. But no Bishop in *England* will give it them. What wonder then, if he was to endeavour to procure it by any other innocent means?

Page 27. "4. In all this, did you, or did you not, palpably violate a certain oath, which you have repeatedly taken? I mean, the oath of Supremacy." No. For *Erasmus* never pretended to any supremacy over the King of *England*, neither did Mr *W.* acknowledge any other power in him, than what every Bishop in *England* acknowledges to be in the Pope.

After giving a short abstract from the oath of supremacy, you ask, "Is not the *conferring of Orders* an act of the highest ecclesiastical power and authority?" It is not any degree of that power and authority intended in the Oath of Supremacy. If it was, no priest of the church of *Rome*, till re-ordained, could be received into our church, without a breach of that oath. You ask, again, "And was not this man a foreigner?" Yes. But he was no foreigner who claimed any supremacy over the King of *England*. "And were not the steps you

“ you took a positive acknowledgment of a foreign power and jurisdiction ?” They were no acknowledgment of any such power or jurisdiction as is intended in the Oath of Supremacy. “ And was not such an acknowledgment a breach of oath ?” *No.*

*Ibid.* You advise him, to “ pretend no longer to love the Church of *England*.” He has given far stronger proof of his love to it, than ever you did : and to this day has kept as close to her side as he could ; with a good conscience.

*Ibid.* “ You may think, perhaps, that I make too free, in expostulating with you so plainly.” Whatever he may *think*, he cannot *wonder*. For he knows every animal must act according to his nature. Hence he expects a *Lion* to roar, and a *Dog* to bark, and a *Man* of your spirit to be *scurrilous*.

Page 28. “ How can Mr *W.* who, on all occasions makes so very free with others ; be angry with young translators, for copying—so very remarkable an example ?” I defy you to find, in all his writings, that he has taken a FIFTIETH part of that freedom with others, that you, (to your honour be it spoken !) have taken with him : No ; to set Religion out of the question, there is more of the Gentleman, and of the man of sense, in Mr *W.* than to throw such senseless, shameless, low abuse, in the face of ANY man.

*Ibid.* You complain, “ I am told, that the evangelical Clergy are leaving no stone unturned to raise *John Calvin’s* ghost, in all quarters of the land.” Evangelical Clergy ! why not Stoical Clergy ? Seeing you say (and I suppose your brethren are of the same mind) “ I have no objection to being called a Stoic, so you but prefix the word *Christian* to it \*.” That these are striving to raise *John Calvin’s* ghost, is certain. And a ghost it is, to be sure ! though less formidable, yet a thousand times more frightful than even the *Witch of Endor*. You proceed : “ If you think the doctrines of that blessed Reformer formidable as a ghost ; you are welcome to do all you can towards laying them.” But what CAN be do, if you, with all your

C 2

theological



theological magic, stand in his way? That you are determined to do this, appears from what follows; "The press is open, and you never had a fairer opportunity of trying your strength on *John Calvin*, than at present." What? has Mr *W.* never had a fairer opportunity of trying his strength, than with Mr *Toplady*? Is it possible you can be so vain, as to imagine this? What an argument of your astonishing self-sufficiency!

*Ibid.* You ask, "Who raised the ghost of *John Goodwin*, the Arminian Regicide; and of *Thomas Grantham*, the Arminian Baptist?"—Sir, as your magic armour is on, and as you think yourself a match for the most formidable spectres; try your strength on *Goodwin* and *Grantham*, particularly on the former. And if you, with the help of ALL your *stoical* brethren, lay that single ghost; I, even I, will promise to lay all the ghosts which you shall raise these seven years.

Again, you ask, "Who raised the ghost of Monsieur *De Renty*, the French Papist; and of many other *Romish* enthusiasts; by translating them into *English*, for the edification of Protestant readers?" There is no Protestant reader who fears God (especially, if his *taste* is not vitiated by such *Antinomian jargon* as yours) but may be greatly edified, by reading the Life of Monsieur *De Renty*, yea, and of *Gregory Lopez* too: Though they were mistaken in several things, as Mr *W.* has shewn; yet, their entire deadness to the world, and the unreserved dedication of their ALL to God, is worthy the imitation of any Protestant.—But before I dismiss this head, let me ask, Why could you not mention, at least, one of these names, without adding a term of reproach? What is this owing to? Is it, because the *Accuser of the brethren* has so filled your heart with HIS VENOM, that, as sure as you open your lips, it flies abroad on all who stand in your way?

Page 29. "Should you take any notice of this letter you say, I have three requests to make."—Mr *W.* take notice of *this letter*! Believe me, Sir, you are in no danger. If you do not know how to treat Mr *W.* he knows

knows how to treat such *gentlemen as you*. But what are your requests? why,

“ 1. Do not print clandestinely.

“ 2. Do not quote unfairly.

“ 3. Do not answer evasively.”

As to what is past, I have demonstrated, that he has acted according to your request. And as to what is to come, you need not trouble your head about it.

*Ibid.* “Canvass the points of doctrine,” you say, “wherein we differ, as strictly as you can.” Believe me, Sir, Mr *W.* will canvass no doctrine with such a *foul-mouthed Doctor as you*.

*Ibid.* “O that you may—no longer prostitute your time and talents to the wiredrawing of chicanery, and the circulation of error!”—Every one who is acquainted with Mr *W.* knows that none can charge him with the prostitution of time. There are few divines who do one half of Mr *W.*’s work: Perhaps you do not as much in a year, as he does in a month. In the few controversial pieces which he has published, (and they are but few when compared to his other tracts) he is so far from *wiredrawing* any point, that he rather inclines to the other extreme. Hence Mr *Hervey* so often complained of the brevity of his remarks; and hence it is that you exclaim against his “printed paper” (consisting of *one sheet*, folded into *twelve pages*, and “price *one penny*.”)

I cannot dismiss this point without observing, that although you seem most devoutly to pray, that he may “no longer prostitute his time and talents to the wire-drawing of chicanery;” yet your real desire is, that he may thus prostitute them still longer. Hence it is that, in this letter, you have sent him so many challenges to meet you in the field; and that you have taken so much pains to provoke him to accept of them: And hence it was that you declared, at a house in *Westminster*, where you and I are well acquainted, that, “if possible, you would drag Mr *W.* out to light.” O Sir! the next time you pass *Westminster* bridge, cast your eyes on the watermen; and while you behold them

*rowing one way, and looking the other, remember this part of your devotion.*

With the same sincerity you pray, that he may "no longer prostitute his time and talents in the circulation of error." If the doctrines which he circulates, are errors, they have been happy errors to thousands; and such as you yourself once embraced with all your heart. It is not many years since you was such an Universalist (yea, and Perfectionist too!) that a certain gentleman could scarce persuade you to give Mr *Whitefield* so much as a single hearing. But by a fresh *wind of doctrine* the weather-cock is now turned from the *east* to the *west*.—How *cased in brass* then must your front be, to tell Mr *W.* of "shifting from system to system;" seeing it is not Mr *W.* who has done this, but you, Mr *Toplady*.

*Ibid.* "I am not insensible of your parts," you say. This is well. But how came you to acknowledge this? Was it to let the world know, that you are able to foil a man of parts? Or was it only for the sake of another opportunity of calling Mr *W.* a *knave*, as you do in the following words; "Alas! what is distinguishing ability, if not wedded to integrity?" Now, Sir, suppose any man was thus, in a great variety of covert language, to call you a knave? Would you scruple to pronounce him *an abusive scoundrel*, if, on demand, he refused to *speak out*, so as to enable you to vindicate your character in a court of justice? Are you, Mr *Toplady*, willing to do this by Mr *W*? To give him an opportunity of vindicating his character in *Westminster-hall*? If not, let every impartial man determine, what title you deserve.

You conclude. "No less just than ingenious, is the remark of a learned and noble writer: The riches of the mind, like those of fortune, may be employed so perversely, as to become a nuisance and pest, instead of an ornament and support to society." That this remark is just, you have given a recent instance. For, *raw* as you are, you are not void of understanding. But, alas! how have you employed



ployed it? is it not in the very manner you complain of? To set this in a clear light, let us sum up the whole affair between Mr *W.* and you.

Scarce had the flame between Papists and Protestants, abated, before that about the Decrees broke out. For more than a century, this war was carried on, with such warmth as was very hurtful to the church of God. From a conviction of this, moderate men moved for a truce; this was followed by a cessation of arms; and in a short time, a *general* peace ensued.

In this state of Tranquillity were the Protestant churches, when you emerged out of obscurity. While you was a student in the College of *Dublin*, God was pleased, by a lay preacher, to bring you to the knowledge of yourself, so far as you *have* been brought. You then was an uncommon admirer, both of Mr *W.* and the *Methodists*. But a certain man leaving the Methodist-society, and turning Anabaptist, you became one of his humble admirers, and close adherents. Notwithstanding this, as you was intended for the service of the established Church, you applied for holy orders; but not being able to obtain them in your own country, you came over to *England* in quest of better fortune. You had not been long in *England*, before you searched out, and got acquainted with Dr *Gill*, of whom in a short time, you became such an admirer, as to prefer him to all the Divines in the Kingdom.

Thus the foundation of your theological learning being laid by a *mungril baptist* in *Ireland*, and the same compleated, by a *baptist Doctor* here, you became a *most sincere* and *most zealous minister of the national Church*; yea, and an Honourable Chaplain to a Right Honourable Lord!

Being now possessed of all treasures, classical, theological and honorary! one of the first things you did, was to search among the rubbish of contention; where you found an old worm-eaten Tract on eternal, unchangeable, and unconditional election and reprobation: written in *Latin*, about two hundred Years ago. This wonderful performance you translated, and sent into

into the world, with all the recommendations in your power. First, you introduced it with a *Preface* of eighteen pages. To this you added an *account of the Author*. This was followed by a *Dissertation on the divine attributes*, consisting of forty pages. Then came the five tremendous chapters of *Zanchius*! Retrenched and enlarged in the translation, you say, "from a desire you had of rendering this treatise as compleat as you could\*." Then, you bring up the rear by an *Appendix* concerning the *Fate of the Heathens*." *Zanch.* p. 125.

The dangerous tendency, of this *unscriptural heathenish* doctrine, together, with the uncommon dogmatism, with which you have recommended it; moved Mr *W.* to publish a short Abridgment of it, that every man might see, *what commodities* you deal in, and with what candour. Which he has done so briefly, as to reduce the price from *two shillings* to *one penny*! This treatment of a performance from which you expected so much applause; not only made you look

"Pale as a young dramatic author, when

"O'er darling lines fell *Cibber* wav'd his pen,"

But awakened all your indignation. In consequence of this, out comes a sixpenny *letter*, in which you roar like a bear bereft of her whelps.—That the reader may see, at one view, what *spirit* you are of, as a *Christian*, and what *taste* you have, as a *writer*, I shall present him with a collection of part of your elegancies, as they stand in your epistle.

Page 2. You call him a "Sophister, a Pope," a "Jesuit," a "Bell-wether." Page 3. Void of "common honour, a lurking sly assassin." Page 4. He is guilty of "audacity and falshood, hardly to be paralleled." Void of "Honour, veracity and justice." Page 6. He is guilty of "Effrontery, and forgery," Deserving to be transmitted "to *Virginia* or *Maryland*, "if not to *Tyburn*!" "he is of a narrow sectarian spirit," of "low serpentine cunning." Page 7. He

uses

\* Preface to *Zanchius*, p. 6.

uses "dirty subterfuges," "a lying sophister!" sunk "beneath the level of an Oyster-woman!" a "Theological coward, a religious gambler." Page 9. He is "possessed of more than serpentine elability." Page 12. with "such a scribler, you would not contend, any more than you would contend for the wall with a chimney-sweeper." Page 13. He resembles "a clumsy bungling anatomist." Page 15. He is an "old plagiarist." Page 16. He is possessed of "Illiberal and malevolent spleen against the Protestant Dissenters." Page 24. a Person, by whom you do not expect "to be treated with the meekness and candour of a Christian;" yet you *wish* him "to write and act with the honesty of an heathen." Page 27. He has "palpably violated a certain oath." Page 30. He is become "a nuisance and pest—to society!"

Now, Sir, I am inclined to think that if you were to go through all Christendom, and search all the magazines of scurrility, pertness, dogmatism, impatience, arrogance, &c. &c. you would scarce find such another *quantity* of these commodities, *flowed together* in *so small* a compass; you would scarce find another instance, of *such a novice*, addressing *such an epistle* to *such a person* as Mr W. a person of such distinguished learning and worth, that nothing but *the reproach of CHRIST*, could prevent his being caressed by the brightest geniuses, and first characters in the land.

And is this the way, Mr *Toplady*, that you treat learning, genius, and great ability? Is this the way that you, a stripling, who have not half put on your armour, treat a veteran, who has stood the brunt of so many campaigns? Is this the way that you honour hoary hairs when found in the way righteousness? Is it *thus* that you put on, as the elect of God, *bowels of mercies, humbleness of mind, brotherly kindness, gentleness, and long-suffering!* Away, away, for shame! away, and—but stop! I remember, and pity your youth; and would fain hope that you are not quite incurable. I would fain persuade myself, that I, almost, discover (at a very great distance!) something which, perhaps, is capable of



of being improved : Therefore, come back, and receive a few words of admonition.

And, 1. As all hopes of future improvement *must* be built on the foundation of repentance for what is past, I advise you to humble yourself, before God and man, for the great insult you have offered to one of the greatest men of the age : and for the pride and haughtiness which you have evidenced on several late occasions ; particularly, at the *Lock Chapel*, in the case of the man in the *Mewse* ; and, in the case of Mr S. Curate of *Bethnal-Green*. These things, Sir, *MUST* be repented of : and you *WILL* repent of them *sooner* or *later*. You may, *now*, while you are full of blood and spirits, *disdain* these words ; but remember, there is a time coming when your *heart and flesh shall fail* ; and I sincerely wish you may not only think of them then ; but also repent of them sincerely.

2. If you desire to be of use in your generation, do not labour to promote *contention*, and *vain jangling*. Remember, he that does this, is *proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and STRIFE OF WORDS, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of CORRUPT minds, and DESTITUTE OF THE TRUTH\**. O Timothy, (O TOPLADY !) *keep that which is committed to thy trust ; AVOIDING profane and vain BABBLINGS, and oppositions of science, falsely so called ; which some professing, (and you among the rest) have erred from the faith†*. O, Sir, if you desire to be a *workman that needeth not to be ashamed ; set life and death before the people, and bid them choose life that they may live ; bid them strive to enter in at the strait gate ; be CAREFUL to maintain good works ; and to endure to the end*. O, Sir ! be as earnest in commending yourself *THUS to every man's conscience in the sight of GOD*, as you have lately been, in recommending *unconditional decrees* ; and you will soon see the difference. For, instead of being instrumental in sowing the seeds of *discord* among men ; you shall be an happy instrument of *saving*

\* 1 Tim. vi. 3—5.

† Ver. 20, 21.

*saving them : yea, and of saving yourself, with those that hear you.*

3. But if, after all, you *will* again sound the trumpet of contention ; if you will again set sail in the sea of strife ; expect that some lover of your soul, some friend of human kind will follow you, in his humble bark to shew you your *folly* and *danger*. In this case, I advise you, not to endeavour to blow him up at a SINGLE BLAST ; not to endeavour to send him, at *once*, like a stone, to the bottom. I advise you not to *fly in his face like a vulture !* not to LEAP upon him, like a LION or a BEAR, as you have done on Mr *W.* and others. In this part of my admonition, I confess, I am somewhat selfish. For if you should prevail with your *exalted Self*, to take any notice of *my* present performance, I am very apprehensive of danger. Perhaps, indeed, I shall have the good fortune, only to hear that you tell your friends, (or at the most, to see a note, in some future page, wherein you will tell the world) that *such a silly scribbler as THIS, is not worthy of YOUR notice.* But, GREAT Sir ! If you should condescend so far as to take this Tract effectually to pieces, I beseech you, do not tell the world that there is not *one single word*, either of *truth* or *sense* in it ! Do not tell the world, that I am the *greatest*, KNAVE, and FOOL, that ever *was*, or ever *will* be born ! I intreat you, in behalf of myself and others, who have presumed to animadvert on you ; yea, and in behalf of all who ever *may* presume to do it, that you will not *kick* us about like so many foot-balls ! that you will not *trample* us under your *magnificent* feet, as you do the mire of the street ! Remember, *the servant of the LORD must not strive*, as YOU HAVE DONE ; *but be GENTLE unto ALL men, apt to teach, PATIENT, in MEEKNESS instructing those that oppose themselves.* O, then, consider HIM who ENDURED such contradiction of sinners against himself : and LEARN of him to be MEEK and LOWLY of heart !

And, in order to this end. I advise you, 4thly, Not to talk so BIG, and look so IMPORTANT, as you have often done, on some late occasions. Remember, you  
are

are but a *young man*. Remember, you are but a *poor Bachelor of Arts*; do not, then, stick yourself up by the side of the gravest Divines, and of the greatest Doctors in the land. Do not think that you are in your place, when you stand, either *on*, or *NEAR*, the same level with *those*. It has the appearance of great vanity, of insufferable pride, for you to challenge into the field those who have both *fought* and *conquered before you were born*. And it is no less pride and folly, for you to tell an *EQUAL*, that if ever he should rise so far as to become a respectable opponent; then, perhaps, you may think him worth your notice! O, Sir! were you that humble, modest man you ought to be; you would think, and speak in a quite different manner: you would believe, and acknowledge too, that when the Curate of *Bethnal-Green* becomes a respectable opponent, he will be no fit opponent for *you*: that when he becomes a man of eminence, you will be as much beneath his notice; as you now, in your vanity, think him beneath yours. Be admonished, therefore, to pray for *HUMILITY*; that you may no longer *think of yourself more highly than you ought to think*; always remembering, that God *resisteth the proud; but giveth GRACE to the humble*.

I am,

Your Servant for CHRIST's sake,

THOMAS OLIVERS.

Jan. 5, 1771.